

storing a sheet usable as a towel or blanket inside a flexible carrying case, and deploying said sheet from said carrying case for usage. Basis for these claims are found in the drawings, in the specification at page 5, line 15 to page 6, line 9, and in originally submitted claims 1-9.

New claims 39-48 are directed to a process of making a carrying case containing a sheet usable as a towel or blanket. Basis for these claims is found in the drawings, in the specification at page 3, line 7 to page 5, line 14, and in originally submitted claims 1-9.

B. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103:

1. Claim 15 is rejected as being unpatentable over Wade in view of Hunt.

This rejection should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth in applicants' appeal brief filed January 16, 2003, pages 8-10, all of which reasons are incorporated herein by reference.

2. Claims 16-28 are rejected "in the same manner as in Paper No. 8, mailed February 28, 2002."

This rejection should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth in applicants' third amendment filed June 4, 2002, pages 3-5, and for the reasons set forth in applicants' appeal brief filed January 16, 2003, pages 8-15, all of which reasons are incorporated herein by reference.

3. Claims 15, 18, 20, 21 and 24 are rejected as being unpatentable over Hunt. The Examiner states: "Hunt teaches all the limitations of claim 15 except the open first end of the carrying case facing a longitudenal (sic) edge of the sheet."

This rejection should be withdrawn. Hunt does not describe a "carrying case". Member 26 of Hunt is an "envelope"; it is not a carrying case. Envelope 26 of Hunt does not have "front and rear walls" as specified in claim 15. The envelope 26 of Hunt has a single wall formed by an inner panel 28 and an outer panel 30. Rotating envelope 26 of Hunt, as suggested by the Examiner, does not cure this deficiency.

4. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected as unpatentable over Hunt in view of Wade.

This rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 16 and 17 are ultimately dependent from claim 15. Hunt does not describe the carrying case of claim 15 for the reasons given above. Wade does not cure this deficiency, being cited for its description of a slip cover pocket.

5. Claim 23 is rejected as unpatentable over Hunt in view of Terrazas.

This rejection should be withdrawn. Claim 23 is dependent from claim 15. Hunt does not describe the carrying case of claim 15 for the reasons given above. Terrazas does not cure

this deficiency, being cited for its description of a waterproof layer attached to the bottom of a flexible sheet.

C. The patentability of new claims 29-38 over Wade and Hunt:

Newly submitted claim 29 is directed to a "process of transporting and storing a sheet usable as a towel or blanket inside a flexible carrying case, and deploying said sheet from said carrying case". Amongst the process steps are:

1. --"reversing said carrying case inside out and stuffing said sheet inside said carrying case--"; and

2. --"deploying said sheet for usage by removing said sheet from said carrying case and turning said carrying case inside out, said outer surface of said carrying case forming the inner surface of a pillow case."

Neither Wade nor Hunt describe such steps.

Newly submitted claims 30-38 are dependent from claim 29.

D. The patentability of new claims 39-48 over Wade and Hunt:

Newly submitted claim 39 is directed to a "process of making a carrying case containing a sheet usable as a towel or blanket". Amongst the process steps is:

--"reversing said carrying case inside out and stuffing said sheet inside said carrying case."

Neither Wade nor Hunt describe such a step.

Newly submitted claims 40-48 are dependent from claim 39.

E. Conclusion:

For the reasons stated above, all of the claims in the application are patentable over the cited prior art, and an early Notice of Allowability is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Robert E. Howard
Registration No. 22,437
(541) 686-4355